



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

von Holleben, "After you, Excellency." This would probably be the beginning of the breaking up of the whole absurd custom of diplomatic precedence inherited from the days when many nations were under suzerainty, and not equal as sovereign and independent states.

### Editorial Notes.

#### Returning the Silver.

On January 17 President Roosevelt took the first step in restoring to China the property belonging to her which was seized by the United States troops. He instructed Secretary Long to hand over to the State Department, for transmission to Wu Ting Fang, the Chinese ambassador, the sum of \$376,000, which represents the value of the silver bullion seized at Tientsin by the United States marines. This bullion, which was found by the marines immediately after the capture of the city, was appraised by a board of officers and sold, and the proceeds were transmitted to Washington and deposited in the Treasury by Secretary Long. The Chinese ambassador at Washington, who had recently made representations to our government for the return of the value of the silver, is highly gratified that the government has decided to restore it. Every American citizen also ought to be gratified at this act of simple justice. Whatever may have been the original intentions of the persons who seized the silver bullion, to have kept this money in the National Treasury would have been on the part of the government nothing less than open intentional robbery. The restoration of property seized during a military campaign is something entirely different from what was accustomed to take place only a few decades ago. It is a striking evidence of the development of the public conscience. A little further evolution in the same direction will make such seizures of property impossible on either land or sea; and a still further evolution in the direction of right will stop the campaigns themselves.

#### Holland's Move for Peace.

The Netherlands Minister of Foreign Affairs has addressed to the British government a note proffering good offices toward ending the South African war. This is reported to have been done at the personal instigation of Queen Wilhelmina, who, with her people, is deeply distressed at the prolongation of the war. It appears that this move of the Dutch government represents Holland alone, though it is said to have the sympathy of other European governments. It has not the official endorsement of the two republics nor of their representatives in Europe. The Dutch note asks for the privilege of sending a commission to South Africa to confer with the Boer leaders and apprise them of the real state of affairs in regard to

intervention, etc. The British government, so far as we can gather from the dispatches, is unwilling to accept the Netherlands proposal as a basis of negotiation because it does not officially represent either the Boer leaders in South Africa nor their representatives in Europe. It is reported to be willing, however, for the Netherlands government to send the proposed commission to South Africa under certain stipulations. It does not seem likely at the moment that anything tangible in the way of peace negotiations will come of this effort. Neither the British government nor the Boers seems ready to yield anything, and so long as they remain thus disposed the war must go on with all its ravages and barbarities. We are glad, however, that the Netherlands offer has been made. It may lead to something else more promising.

Should Order an Investigation. Senator Hoar's resolution for an inquiry by a special commission into the condition of affairs in the Philippines ought to have met with the full and cordial approval of every citizen in the nation. A condition of affairs has existed out there, and continues to exist, as accumulating evidence discloses, which is a lasting disgrace to any country calling itself civilized. Our country professes to carry on war in what is called a "civilized" way. It is not doing it in the Philippines, as everybody now knows. The reconcentrado method of conquest, over which this country wrote its angry condemnation in blood in the case of Cuba, has been introduced, and is being extended, wherever the Filipino insurgents continue any decided opposition to having their country fall under the dominion of a foreigner who has so far shown them little cause to do anything but bitterly hate him. As we are writing this, the cable says that this system is at once to be put in force by General Bell in Batangas province, just south of Manila, that a certain zone is to be established around the garrisons into which the friendly inhabitants will be forced to come, under penalty of confiscation and destruction of their property. The insurgents, if they continue to try to maintain their cause by the only methods of which under the circumstances they are capable, are to be treated as outlaws and outside of the pale of "civilized warfare!" Senator Hoar ought to press his resolution with all possible speed. Nor ought it to have been turned over to Senator Lodge's Philippine committee, where it will most probably be smothered to death. There is no evidence, so far as we know, that this committee has done anything whatever to keep this country informed of the true state of things in the island or to check the shameful proceedings — "water cure," reconcentration, burning of villages — that have gone on there. To such cruel and shameful extremes is a country driven in its attempts to subdue a people whose

love of their own land and its independence makes them decline to be subdued. The whole government policy of annexation and subjugation has proved itself a costly and miserable failure. The islands are to-day fuller of hate and bitterness towards us than ever before, as all the later news shows, and these new efforts at terrorizing will probably drive out the last remaining vestige of respect for us. Unless we return to the right course, — what was right in the beginning, is now, and evermore shall be, — there is nothing to be expected but sullen and deceitful enmity towards us which will require us to maintain on the islands a big army, with all that this involves, for no one knows how long in the future. An immediate return to the right would produce an immediate change in the disposition of the Filipinos towards us. Nothing else ever will, as the nation will find out to its sorrow and shame as the years go on.

**The Powers  
and China.**

On the 22d of January, for the first time in the intercourse of China with the outside world, the ministers of the foreign powers were received by the Chinese Emperor, who has returned to Peking, as representatives of sovereigns equal in rank with him. The audiences given the ministers were held in the innermost large hall of the Forbidden City. The replies to the addresses of the ministers, copies of which were handed to the Emperor, were delivered by Prince Ching, the Emperor himself, seated on a dais behind the table, remaining silent and looking weak and impassive, as reported by the legation secretaries. Sir Ernest Satow, the British representative, made the following address:

“My august sovereign has charged me to express to your majesty his sincere desire to see the independence and the integrity of the Chinese Empire maintained intact, and that the prosperity and happiness of the Chinese people may be hastened by the removal of obstacles to the free exchange of commodities, by the extension of manufactures and by the utilization of the resources of the soil.

“The wonderful improvements in the means of communication between different parts of the world, through the development of steam navigation, railways and telegraphs, has brought all countries into much closer relations than was possible in former times. Thus the nations of the world are enabled to profit by the lessons to be learned from each other in the art of government, in methods of education, in the administration of justice and the application of the public wealth to the advantage of the whole people.

“If, under the enlightened rule of your majesty, the barriers which in the past hindered the free and mutually advantageous intercourse of China with the rest of the world be completely removed and her domestic institutions wisely regulated, it is certain that China, advancing along the path of progress, will attain to a height of prosperity unknown in the past.”

This event, significant as it is, would have been much more satisfactory and encouraging for the future if there was not the record of so much iniquity, aggression and desolation behind it.

**Spurgeon  
on Conquest.**

At a time years ago when the British government was engaged in an attempt, long contemplated and carefully planned, to seize and annex territory in the north of India, the late Mr. Spurgeon wrote home the following message from Mentone:

“The grand blasts from Mr. Gladstone’s war-horn should arouse our nation. The one note is a call to make righteousness and peace guides of the nation instead of selfishness and blustering. Will men hear the call? Alas! it is to be feared that self and pride have greater claims. ‘British interests’ are regarded as solid matters of consideration, while humanity and justice are treated as mere sentimental superfluities. The *Times*, which is ever the faithful mirror of the national mind, says about Afghanistan, which we have been so wantonly trampling under foot, ‘Whatever is done must be done with the sole view to the future safety of India.’ No notion of what is best for Afghans ought to come in the way. That is their business and not ours. It is our business to destroy all settled government in their country, and, after ravaging the land, to leave poor wretches to make such arrangements as they can. Under such tutors we shall soon become a nation of demons. Time was when high principle ruled British hearts, and all parties in the state paid homage to liberty, to justice and even humanity; but now we are another people, ruled by other lords. Can there be too much speaking against this? Ought Christians to be too excited and too eager to save their country from the evil which now sits dominant upon it? We think not. He who shall be backward when the time comes to deliver his land, let this great sin cleave unto him. If he will not rise to rescue his people from huge crimes into which her present rulers are plunging her, he will be partaker in their sins, and on his own head must the curse descend.”

**Uncivilized  
Crimes.**

In a letter to the Messrs. Collier, of *Collier’s Weekly*, which was read at a banquet given the staff of the paper on January 27th, Andrew Carnegie wrote as follows:

“The killing of men by men under the name of war is the foulest blot upon humanity to-day. We see much discussion as to what is or what is not permissible under civilized warfare. My view is that this is a contradiction of terms. There can be no such thing as civilized warfare. We have made little progress in the path of genuine civilization as long as we can find no better substitute for the settling of international disputes than the brutal murder of one another. As a general proposition, it may be stated that the nation which refuses peaceful arbitration is responsible for the war which ensues. Britain, having done this in its dispute with the Transvaal Republic, is responsible for the extermination of a brave and

heroic Christian people. But let us also remember that we are to-day engaged in shooting down Christian Filipinos whose only crime is that they believe in the Declaration of Independence. Sad that both branches of the so-called most highly civilized race should be guilty of the most uncivilized crimes! Let us all pray that this disgrace may soon pass away."

**Egyptian-Hittite  
Treaty of Peace.**

"On a wall of the great Temple of Karnak, in Egypt," writes Josiah W. Leeds, "there is an elaborately sculptured record of the campaign of Rameses II., against the Kheta (the Hittites), including the Treaty of Peace which was framed after the two armies had probably about reached the point of exhaustion, for the war had been waged as far northward in Syria as the Orontes. The last clause of this remarkable document in stone, while stipulating that the contracting parties shall deliver up to each other the political fugitives of both countries, provides at the same time for the personal safety of the offenders. 'Whosoever shall be so delivered up,' says the treaty, 'himself, his wives, his children, let him not be smitten to death; moreover, let him not suffer in his eyes, in his mouth, in his feet; moreover, let not any crime be set up against him.' Now, this second Rameses was a wonderful temple builder, and it cannot be doubted that his numerous self-laudatory monuments called for great hardships and loss of life in their construction. Yet this treaty of thirty-three hundred years ago, on the part of a ruler whose religious cult was polytheistic, and included the veneration of scarabs, hawks, and crocodiles, remains, as Amelia B. Edwards says of it, 'a remarkable illustration of the clemency with which international law was at that time administered.' At any rate, the North African despot's way of ending a pitiful war seems not to suffer alongside of what we behold to-day in South Africa and in the subject isles of the Filipinos."

**A Teacher  
of Peace.**

The celebrated Russian artist, Vassili Verestchagin, whose war pictures are now so famous throughout the world, is in this country, and has been superintending an exhibition of his paintings in Chicago. Realistic battle scenes and the tragic character of war furnish the themes of his most celebrated pictures. Through these he has done much to create a disgust for war, for he paints it in its naked reality, throwing over it none of the glamour with which it is so often clothed. Von Moltke at one time forbade his troops to go to see Verestchagin's vivid delineations of the horrors of war, and none of the military governments of Europe have cared to have these dread-inspiring canvases before the eyes of their people. Verestchagin's great collection, which fills five galleries of the Chicago Art Institute, has recently been increased

by the painting of eleven large pictures of the war in the Philippines. In an article in the February magazine number of the *Outlook*, Charles DeKay, of the National Art Club, thus writes about Verestchagin:

"Painters may hold that, so far as they are concerned, there is no room for works like those of Verestchagin; but the public thinks otherwise. The public has a robust enjoyment of things in art which are analogous with the mystery plays of the Middle Ages and the pictures in stained glass and mosaic in the old churches, whose purpose was to instruct and better the observer by showing him the good works of saints and the evil works of pagan persecutors of the elect. The war correspondent is sometimes consciously, sometimes unwittingly, a man who draws a moral from scenes of slaughter or presents the shocking side of war so realistically that the reader is won, at least for a time, to the side of peace. A conspicuous example of this was the book published some years ago by M. de Bloch, lately deceased, which, on good authority, is said to have stimulated the young Czar to efforts that resulted in the Peace Conference at The Hague. So does the illustrator for the press who accompanies the war correspondent have it in his power to do what he can to disgust the public with war by showing its horrible side. Vassili Verestchagin is such a war reporter, only he uses big canvases and oil paints, and employs his talents in the path well beaten through literature by Count Tolstoy, his predecessors and successors in Russia and Germany and France."

Dr. Kitchin, Dean of Durham, one of the clearest-sighted and most courageous Christian ministers in England, in "A Warm Greeting for the New Year" to the peace journal *War or Brotherhood*, writes as follows of the madness with which he feels that his country is smitten:

"May we see with kindled eyes the dawn of a Spirit of Peace in the coming spring, and the awakening of the sleeping national conscience. I am perpetually haunted with the mediæval aphorism, 'Whom God wishes to destroy he first makes mad.' Surely we are passing through an access of insanity, of national bewilderment, in which neither the true nature of our acts is discerned nor the proportion of things maintained. In a word, Are we not mad? When before has society had such a fear of truth? When was there such a conspiracy of darkness in this country? And with it, how amazing a display of arrogant ignorance, and a contempt for the geographical and historical truths which would have warned us! When has the land been under such a seed-casting of falsehood and slander? When so lamentable a deadness of conscience? When such a worship of low aims, and cringing to money and greed for dividends from so-called industries of war? Where in history can we find a parallel to the gloating over bloodshed and the ungenerous delight in this piteous war on women and babes? How is it that we refuse to understand the inglorious and vulgar qualities of a war waged by the strong against the weak, by the millions against the hundreds? Why cannot we see that it is idiocy to slander and rake up rumors

about the meanness of our adversary? From another side: When in our history has there been such a craving for excitement, and such intoxication of mind over some trivial success? When in our history can we find such meanness as that of a Mafeking day? And are we really the tools of gambling foreigners? And are we making war, dazzled by glint of gold, and indifferent to all thoughts of justice? Above all, is it patriotic to make no protest against the angry attacks on freedom, personal and constitutional, which have forever smirched the fair name of England? Are we really content, for such reward, to throw away the liberties which have been hardly won by our ancestors in a thousand years of glorious struggle for freedom? For these appalling reasons we seem quite content to take the first step towards ruin; and, like a mad bull, close our eyes, see nothing, and rush on head down to what we know not, senseless and doomed."

---

Baron d'Estournelles, one of the French members of the Hague Court, had published in the *Matin* a remarkable open letter to Lord Rosebery in reference to his Chesterfield speech, from which we take some passages:

"The drama which drags itself out eternally in South Africa has but two peoples for actors; but it has for witness the whole civilized world. Now there exists at present — you yourself have said so, eloquently — a tribunal of the world. If you recognize that a conscience common to all men begins to awaken, will you refuse it the right of making itself heard?"

"You are surprised that Europe deplores the Transvaal War. Instead of seeing in the grievous pity that moves it a valuable sign, you only find there a mark of hostility against your country, a sign of the hatred of Europe, and therefore one motive more for England remaining obstinately deaf to every foreign voice.

"Allow me to express regret at this confusion. No, it is not England, it is the war that Europe detests, and it is not your enemies, be sure, — it is, on the contrary, your friends, — who suffer when they see England engaged in a struggle of which extermination and ruin are the only issues.

"Consider the painful embarrassment, the distress of those who were your friends in Europe, and be good enough for a moment to put yourself impartially in their place. I am one of them, you know. I have proved it. No one has desired more than I have to see your country and mine dissipate the misunderstandings which divide them, and every time that the mistake, even in the question of Egypt, appeared to me to be on our side, I have said so publicly without fearing to compromise myself.

"You are not detested, you are judged; and it is above all your friends, who are the furthest removed from hate, that suffer most from the disavowals that you inflict upon the confidence they have shown you. They suffer not in their pride, but in what is most praiseworthy in them, their concern for justice, liberty, progress; they suffer when they see violence triumph to-day in the country which yesterday made itself glorious by scorning violence; they suffer, in a word, when they see the

eclipse of the liberal spirit occur just where they believed it to be best protected against every assault.

"The acts of a great country like England have their echo throughout the world. A whole school of politicians that your example and your generous traditions were able to restrain in their pursuit of a most maleficent popularity are now everywhere turning back to favor their thesis, and openly letting loose base appetites against every part of the globe for the accomplishment of the basest conquests. What will you reply to them?"

"This is what your friends say. Do you mistake for hatred their sadness and disquietude? Will you not allow yourself the right of deploring your own errors as you do theirs when these errors interest mankind. Will you oblige them to renounce the admirations and hopes of their whole lifetime, to recognize that their dreams were chimeras, and that civilization has brought the nations nearer only to precipitate them blindly one against another?"

"No, Lord Rosebery! Allow a Frenchman the right of saying to you, without hatred and without fear, — without fear of being treated as an Anglophobe in London, or an Anglomaniac in Paris, — that Europe is without prejudice, but that she calls with her whole soul for the end of a war which horrifies her."

---

#### Naval Rhetoric.

Captain Richmond Pearson Hobson, whose chief claim to recognition by his countrymen was the daring but perfectly useless feat of sinking the "Merrimac" in the mouth of Santiago Harbor, has been treating citizens of Boston and other places to some rather extraordinary naval rhetoric. Nobody denies that, as navies go, the United States navy has made a record of extraordinary success, but to say that "if there is a scroll of honor under the sun, it is the scroll of the navy" of the United States, is a bit too emotional even for a naval officer. If the business of smashing ships, blowing in pieces fortifications, and crushing, burning and sinking men to death, when carried on with success, can then entitle persons to the highest imaginable honor in the affairs of this world, then Captain Hobson's statement might have some claim to pass unchallenged. But there are deeds of philanthropy and beneficence, far-reaching in their transforming effects, which have been done in many countries and at many times in the interest of humanity, that rank as much above any naval exploits recorded as light is above darkness. Captain Hobson's audience is said to have broken forth in a storm of long-continued applause at the mention, on the honor roll, of the names of Dewey, Sampson and Schley, who have recently done little but quarrel over "glory." Have these stormers and Captain Hobson ever really considered how nearly the naval battles of Manila and Santiago resembled little more than mere target practice? Captain Hobson thinks that the presence of our fleet off China was the only thing that saved the partition of the empire, and that "a great and powerful American fleet" is the only thing that

will prevent such partition in the future and the consequent setting of the world on fire. Older heads than his think that John Hay, and Great Britain, and the mutual jealousies of the powers had something to do with preventing partition. It is a pity to spoil the young hero's rhetoric by asking what prevented the partition of China all the years before we had our present navy. What Captain Hobson means by sending the Monroe Doctrine far and wide, even to "the golden wall of China," is not quite clear. He wants it over there, evidently, that the navy may have the "honor" of defending it, as if it were not sufficient "glory" to do that over here. Captain Hobson dreams of a great Slav wave of conquest over Central and Western Europe, and asks how *we* could prevent this except by a great navy! He does not tell us how we could manipulate a great navy on the *soil* of Western Europe against a Slav wave that was big enough to engulf all Germany, England and the rest of the Western nations, combined armies, fleets and all. At the close of his Boston lecture Captain Hobson made a plea for twenty-five, nay fifty, nay a hundred millions a year of appropriations for the *increase* of the navy. One of the ladies on the platform at the close of the speech suggested that the only way to get these appropriations was to send Hobson to Congress. We should say that is the best possible way to prevent any appropriations at all, for no bill in Congress could possibly live in such a sea of rhetoric as filled Lorimer Hall during the speech to which we are referring.

**Church Review  
on Modern War.**

The editor of the *Hartford Church Review*, in a finely conceived editorial in the January number of his paper, says that "with our traditions, our love of country, our patriotism, too, which is sometimes so strangely warped, it is hard to take an absolutely unprejudiced view of what we know as modern warfare!" He then asks: "Is there, however, anything under the sun so astounding and awful as the method by which the nations of the earth settle their disputes in this nineteen hundred and second year of our Lord Jesus Christ?" The interrogation goes straight to the centre of the matter except in one particular. Instead of "settle their disputes" he might more appropriately have written "keep up and aggravate and create disputes." The governments of the great nations can scarcely be said any longer even to attempt to settle their controversies by war. They talk about it, worry about it, fear it, make infinite preparations for it, but they no longer fight except against puny nations, from which there is nothing to fear. They settle their real differences with one another by negotiation or arbitration, or let them go unsettled, as in the case of the Alaska boundary dispute, and then fool their citizens

into support of their monstrous war preparations by concocting imaginary differences and by the loud pretense that war is forever just ready to fall upon them from some quarter or other. This, however, only adds to the astounding character of the facts, as they would be recorded in his book entitled "My Impressions of the Earth," by the *Review's* supposed visitor, fresh from the planet Mars. It is difficult sometimes to accept the theory that it is traditions and the prejudices of education which make it hard to take an impartial view of modern warfare. It would seem that any person with only a modicum of intelligence and of moral freedom ought to see and realize the amazing folly and iniquity of it, in spite of the traditions and prejudices among which he has grown up.

**Reminiscence  
of Sumner.**

Hon. L. H. Pillsbury of West Derry, N. H., sends us the following interesting information:

"A little after the War of the Rebellion, in which I participated as a captain of infantry, I removed to Kansas; and while engaged in pastoral pursuits, I found time to reflect, and became convinced of the supreme unreasonableness of war, its expensiveness and its wickedness. I sat down and wrote to the Hon. Charles Sumner, then a United States Senator, asking him if there were no concerted movement or organization to work out its abolishment. He was kind enough to notice and promptly answer a young herdsman of the plains, in the following language, as nearly as I can remember: 'I know of no society in the United States whose object is the suppression of this form of barbarism except the American Peace Society of Boston, Mass. I had expected to make it my life work to oppose war, but I found myself confronted with slavery; and slavery is war, except that in this case the weaker party is beaten in detail.' He gave me the address of the American Peace Society, and I immediately secured a membership in it, and have remained a member ever since, now nearly forty years. I think I see in the pronounced and intelligent opposition to the war in South Africa and that in the Philippines, in the Hague and the Pan-American Congresses, an advance in public sentiment against this hoary and gory 'bulwark of hatred and of hell' that would have rejoiced the heart of this noble martyr to liberty and peace."

**A French  
Non-Resistant.**

The following case of a young French Christian, who refused to do military service because he had become convinced that war is wholly wrong and unchristian, might be paralleled from nearly every country in Europe, not only among Christians, but among simple humanitarians. Increasing numbers of young men in these countries are refusing, for conscience' sake, to train themselves in the art of human slaughter, and their example would have a much more powerful effect if the cases were not

kept so out of sight by the officials. The London *Daily News* is responsible for this account:

"The French Minister of War has just sent home a soldier named Gontaudier, whose story is not commonplace. Gontaudier emigrated to the United States as a lad, and joined the Quakers. When his time came to serve in the French army, he returned to France and, before the military authorities, stated that his religious principles forbade him carrying a rifle. He was court-martialed and sentenced to two years' imprisonment. Having served his sentence out, he was sent back to the regiment. There he stated that his religious views had not altered, and he was again sentenced to two years.

"Probably this second penalty for one offense was illegal, but legality, as everybody knows, is held by courts-martial as a thing to be honored rather in the breach than otherwise. He had served the greater part of this second sentence when attention was called to his case by the *Aurore*. General André, Minister of War, at once decided that he should be sent to serve his three years in the ambulance corps. It now turns out that Gontaudier, being the only son of an aged mother, was liable to one year's service only, and ought to have been sent away long ago. The Minister of War has just recognized this."

The International Peace Bureau at Berne has sent the following letter to the presidents of Chile and the Argentine Republic, in view of the amicable adjustment of their boundary dispute:

"*Mr. President:* In the name of the Permanent International Peace Bureau, established at Berne in 1891 by the societies devoted to the peace movement throughout the world, we take the liberty of expressing to you how much we appreciate the conciliatory attitude of the Chilean and Argentinian governments on the occasion of the controversy which has threatened to bring desolation and sorrow among peoples of South America. We do not undertake to pass judgment on the causes of the dispute, but we have the firm hope that you will persevere in your efforts to hold in check the dangerous excitements and evil passions which tend to war. The line of moderate and prudent conduct which you have so far followed in order to prevent an appeal to arms assures to you the esteem of the civilized world, in whose view a war between the two nations would be an event disastrous to the cause of progress and of justice, as well as to the material interests of the populations, the two essential elements of which are labor and peace."

The International Peace Congresses have usually been held late in the season.

This year, it seems, it is to be otherwise. The International Peace Bureau at Berne, after consulting the peace societies, has, by a vote of thirteen to nine of its Commission, decided to hold the Congress this year at Monaco the first week in April. There were invitations from only two places, Toulouse and Monaco. To-

louse finally withdrew its invitation. The Prince of Monaco, who is greatly interested in the peace movement, and much desired to have the Congress meet in his principality this season, could not receive it in the autumn. So April has been decided upon, as two other congresses are to meet there that month. If any of the members of the American Peace Society expect to be in Europe at that time, and will be willing to represent the Society, we shall be glad if they will inform us at once. The time is short, as the meeting of the Congress is only two months off.

#### Alaskan Dispute.

In a recent letter to the *Nation*, Mr. Thomas Willing Balch of the Philadelphia Bar claims that there is nothing in the Alaska boundary dispute to arbitrate. After discussing the meaning of the treaty between Russia and England in 1825, on which the claims of our government rest, he says that "the evidence in the case is all in favor of the United States." "There is no more reason for this country to agree to refer its right to the possession and sovereignty of this unbroken Alaskan *lisière* to the decision of foreigners than would be the case if the English empire advanced a demand to sovereignty over the coast of the Carolinas or the port of Baltimore, and suggested that the claim should be referred to the judgment of the subjects of third powers." This seems to us a most extreme position to take. We have no more doubt than Mr. Balch that the evidence is all in favor of the United States. But British and Canadian statesmen and publicists do not think so, unless we are to set down a number of the most eminent of them as downright liars and deceivers. This we hardly feel justified in doing. Again, to be unwilling to let such a case go to arbitration, for fear of a decision against us, is to greatly underrate the intelligence and conscientiousness of any three or five public men from foreign nations to whom the case might be referred. If the evidence is all in our favor, it is impossible that such a body of men could find it to be against us. Mr. Balch's comparison of the Alaska case to the supposed one of the Carolina coast or the port of Baltimore is most irrelevant; for in the one case there is a *border line* between the two countries, in the other supposed one none at all.

#### King's Speech from the Throne.

When the British Parliament was opened, on the 16th of January, King Edward read his own speech, written for him of course by the ministry, from the throne. He declared that his relations with other powers continued to be of a *friendly* character, though he did not explain exactly what he meant by "friendly." It was probably this sentence which led Lord Rosebery to call the speech one of the most "jejune"



ever placed on the lips of a monarch. The King must have known while pronouncing the word that there never was less foreign friendship for England than now, and justly so, because never before in her history has she more deeply offended the Christian conscience of the world. A still more "hungry" part of the speech was the passage in which the King declared that the humanity, even to their own detriment, of his troops in South Africa in their treatment of the enemy was deserving of the highest praise. Over this "lean" utterance peers, peeresses and high officials broke out into loud and long-continued applause, which broke all the dignified traditions of the House of Lords. The King hoped that the international conference on sugar bounties might lead to the abandonment of a system which unfairly weighted his sugar-producing colonies. He referred to the conclusion of the Canal treaty with this country, under guaranties that its neutrality would be maintained and that it would be open to the commerce of all nations. He also mentioned the conclusion of the treaty with Brazil for the arbitration of the Guiana-Brazil boundary question. He regretted that the war in South Africa was not yet concluded, but declared that the area of it had been *largely reduced*, and that industries were being resumed in "his new colonies." Whatever one may think of Lord Rosebery's epithet "jejune," the King's speech is certainly much more remarkable for the serious things which it ignores than for those which it mentions, important as some of these are.

#### Pan-American Congress Closes

The Pan-American Congress closed on the 31st ult. The families of the delegates were present by invitation at the final session. After its close the delegates were received by President Diaz, who congratulated them on the eminently practical results of their labors. He expressed the hope that each one of them on returning home would be a messenger of peace and of confraternity among the American republics. In his address closing the Conference, Señor Ignacio Mariscal, the Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs, spoke in part as follows, as to the advance made of the principle of arbitration, the most commanding subject before the Conference:

"You have advanced in practice the great principle of arbitration, the peaceful and the educational solution of international controversies, so as to render less frequent the barbarous appeal to force. Ten delegations have reached an agreement and signed a treaty of compulsory arbitration with exceptions similar to those that figured in the Washington treaty, which miscarried in 1890, a fate which we may reasonably hope is not reserved for the present convention. Nevertheless, it is not the principal triumph obtained in the matter of arbitration.

That triumph is undoubtedly the unanimous agreement of all of the delegations, in spite of their apparently radical divergence as to the application of that great principle, to submit for settlement to the permanent arbitration court of The Hague controversies that arise among the governments of America due to the claims of private individuals for indemnities and damages. When the convention in question once comes into force, these complaints and claims which most inflame the minds of men and embitter international relations will be settled peacefully in the manner dictated by equity and the highest considerations of expediency. Finally, you have unanimously agreed to recognize the principles proclaimed by the Hague peace convention, and are prepared to become parties to the conventions concluded by the conference. And in order to secure admittance to one of them you have empowered the governments of the United States and Mexico, who are among the signatory powers, to conduct the negotiations which such admittance entails; by this means all our sister nations of America will secure, among other advantages, a clear right to appeal to the eminent court established at the capital of the Netherlands, whenever they may desire that it should adjudicate their controversies."

#### Not Useless to Protest.

*The Watchman* in a recent number, speaking of the influentially signed remonstrance against the proposed vast increase in naval expenditures recently sent from Boston to Washington, says:

"The strongly worded protest so influentially signed against the huge naval appropriations seems to us to overlook the fact that these expenditures were involved in the policy adopted by our government in negotiating the treaty of Paris with Spain. These vast appropriations cannot be withstood after the policy that makes them necessary has been adopted. The time for effective protest was more than three years ago."

It seems to us that this position of the *Watchman*, whose editor is opposed to the policy adopted in the treaty of Paris, is untenable from every point of view. First, we do not see the evidence that the new program of naval increase is involved in the policy adopted in the Paris treaty. Some increase in the navy is doubtless involved in that policy, but nothing like that proposed. It is nearer the truth to say that the policy adopted at Paris has grown out of naval development and exploits rather than *vice versa*. The naval increase has been steadily going on since 1885, and has only been quickened by recent events. But if these increased expenditures, or, in other words, a large expansion of the navy, were involved in the policy, is that a sufficient reason for withholding protest? Shall a great national sin be allowed to go unprotested after the initial stage until it reaches



its culmination? Can we not often, by exposing the dangerousness of the first fruits of such a policy, thus best secure the ultimate abandonment of the policy itself? Was it useless to protest against the greed of the slave power for new territory because such greed was involved in the nationally accepted system of slavery? *The Watchman* would hardly so contend. The policy adopted in the treaty of Paris with Spain is producing so many evil fruits that we should be a nation of hopeless weaklings if we held our mouths about them. It is the continued protest of so many people throughout the nation against these evil fruits that is bringing the country to its senses about the wickedness of the policy itself. This policy, from many present indications, at least in its worst features, is fast losing its hold on the nation and is certain before long to be abandoned. The people who originated this naval remonstrance were among the strongest of the original protestants three years ago, and it is a most favorable omen that many others, who at first did not protest, are willing to join them now.

Commenting on the article in *Scribner's Monthly* for January, by Mr. Vanderlip, on "The American Commercial Invasion of Europe," the *New York Evening Post* says:

"Perhaps the most pungent and timely part of Mr. Vanderlip's article is that in which he frankly reminds us of the way in which our sudden rush into swollen military expenditure is imperilling our industrial supremacy. He gives some striking utterances of foreign statesmen and financiers on this subject. The Russian Minister of Finance, M. De Witte, said that 'militarism is the nightmare and the ruin of every European finance minister,' and thought the fact that the United States had 'no great military burden' to be no small part of her good fortune. But our foreign rivals are watching with ill-concealed glee our fatuous course in going out of our way to bind such a burden on our backs. One of 'the most eminent of European financiers' said to Mr. Vanderlip, when asked how the Old World could possibly withstand American competition: 'Something will happen. . . . It may be that it is your *colonial policy*. . . . We are glad to see you going into the *Philippines*. We will welcome the time if you are going to measure strength with us as a military power.'

"The actual weight of our military burden is understated by Mr. Vanderlip. Comparing the United States with Europe, he finds that we pay out for army and navy only \$205,000,000 a year, as against \$1,380,000,000 spent in Europe. But the only fair comparison is that of per capita taxation for military purposes. Mr. Vanderlip's 'Europe' means 336,000,000 of inhabitants, who thus have to pay \$4.10 each for the support of army and navy. But the 76,000,000 of Americans are now paying (counting in, as Mr. Vanderlip should have done, the \$140,000,000 a year in pensions) \$4.50 a head for the same purposes. Already, therefore, we are gratuitously crippling ourselves with military expenses in a

way to give our competitors hope, and our colonial and military ambitions are calling for more money every year. Was there ever such a clear case of national folly? At the height of our great opportunity, with the markets of the world at our mercy, we stupidly cling to a fiscal policy which turns the hand of every trading nation against us, and then proceed further to weight ourselves in the race for commercial supremacy, where we might so easily have a clear course, by committing the very blunder our anxious competitors were hoping we would fall into,—that is, we sap our strength and dissipate our energies by going in for costly colonies and a burdensome military establishment."

### Brevities.

. . . During this year the navy will be increased by the completion of one battleship, three protected cruisers, four monitors, sixteen torpedo boats and sixteen torpedo-boat destroyers. There are under construction eight battleships, six armored cruisers, nine protected cruisers, one gunboat, four monitors, sixteen destroyers, nine torpedo boats, seven submarine boats; making a total of sixty vessels.

. . . *City and State*, of Philadelphia, has published in pamphlet the evidence which it declares to be "morally conclusive proof that the so-called 'water-cure' torture has, during a period of nearly two years, been systematically used in the Philippines, under the ægis of our flag, to produce political or military results." The pamphlet is excruciating reading to one who loves his country's honor.

. . . At the annual meeting of the New York State Bar Association, held at Albany on the 21st ult., Mr. Jules Cambon, the French Ambassador, said: "The fundamental duty of diplomacy is to enforce respect for the provisions of international law and so foster their continuous development, thereby rendering essential service to the advancement of civilization and strengthening the social bond which links together the nations of the world."

. . . The British government has already expended more than sixty-two million dollars for horses alone in the South African war, the whole number of horses used to the end of October last being three hundred thousand nine hundred.

. . . Great Britain has decided to take the same course adopted by the United States and return to China that portion of the imposed indemnity which may not be required to cover actual expenses and damages.

. . . Hon. Henry B. Metcalf, in a recent letter to one of the Pawtucket (R. I.) papers, says that the thing which troubles him most about our Philippine proceedings is "whether our Christian nation is really trying to find an honorable method whereby slaughter of Americans as well as Filipinos may cease."

. . . In a recent address Mr. Bryan gives the following definition of patriotism: "I do not think I can define patriotism better than to say that it is that love of country which leads a man to give to his country that which his country needs at the time that his country needs it."